arXiv:1410.4856v1 [stat.ME] 17 Oct 2014

A multidimensional latent class IRT model for non-ignorable missing responses*

Silvia Bacci†
Department of Economics, University of Perugia (IT)
email: silvia.bacci@stat.unipg.it

Francesco Bartolucci*
Department of Economics, University of Perugia (IT)
email: bart@stat.unipg.it

October 21, 2014

Abstract

We propose a structural equation model, which reduces to a multidimensional latent class item response theory model, for the analysis of binary item responses with non-ignorable missingness. The missingness mechanism is driven by two sets of latent variables: one describing the propensity to respond and the other referred to the abilities measured by the test items. These latent variables are assumed to have a discrete distribution, so as to reduce the number of parametric assumptions regarding the latent structure of the model. Individual covariates may also be included through a multinomial logistic parametrization of the probabilities of each support point of the distribution of the latent variables. Given the discrete nature of this distribution, the proposed model is efficiently estimated by the Expectation-Maximization algorithm. A simulation study is performed to evaluate the finite-sample properties of the parameter estimates. Moreover, an application is illustrated to data coming from a Students' Entry Test for the admission to some university courses.

KEYWORDS: EM algorithm, Finite mixture models, Item response theory, Semiparametric inference, Students' Entry Test

*The present paper has been accepted for the publication on *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal.*

†Both authors acknowledge the financial support from the grant FIRB ("Futuro in ricerca") 2012 on "Mixture and latent variable models for causal inference and analysis of socio-economic data", which is funded by the Italian Government (RBFR12SHVV). The authors are also grateful to Dr. B. Bertaccini of the University of Florence (IT) for making available the data.

1 Introduction

A relevant problem in applications of Item Response Theory (IRT) models is related to missing responses to some items. Following the general theory of Little and Rubin (2002), we define missing item responses to be *ignorable* if: (*i*) these responses are missing at random (MAR), that is, the event that the response to an item is missing is conditionally independent of the (unobservable) response to this item given the observed responses to the other items and (*ii*) the missing mechanism is governed by a model based on a distinct set of parameters with respect to the parameters of the model governing the response process. Under ignorability, maximum likelihood estimation of the parameters of the IRT model of interest is only based on the observed responses.

Obviously, when condition (*i*) or (*ii*) above does not hold, then missing responses are *non-ignorable* and the missingness mechanism must be modeled along with the relationships of direct interest to avoid wrong inferential conclusions and loss of relevant information for the assessment of the examinees' ability level. A typical example of non-ignorable missing responses (or missing not at random, MNAR) is observed with educational tests where, in order to avoid guessing, a wrong item response is penalized to a greater extent in comparison with a missing response. In such a context, it is natural to suppose that the choice of not answering to a given item is related to the ability (or abilities) measured by the test.

In the statistical literature there exist different approaches to model a non-ignorable missing mechanism. Among the best known, we recall the *selection approach* (Diggle and Kenward, 1994) and the *pattern-mixture approach* (Little, 1993). The first formulation defines a joint model of observed and missing responses and factorizes the corresponding distribution in a marginal distribution for the complete data (union of observed and missing responses) and a conditional distribution for the missing data given the complete data. In contrast, the pattern-mixture approach specifies the marginal distribution for the missing responses and the conditional distribution of the complete data given the missing responses.

Recently, Formann (2007) showed that on the basis of the latent class (LC) model (Lazarsfeld and Henry, 1968; Goodman, 1974) it is possible to define class of MNAR models, which is distinct from that of selection models and that of pattern-mixture models. He treated the presence of non-ignorable missing entries in the case of repeated measurements of the same variable or observations of different variables made on the same individuals. The approach is based on creating an extra category for missing responses, so as to model the missingness mechanism, and analyzing the data coded in this way by means of an LC model. In this way each latent class is also characterized in terms of missing responses. Moreover, individual covariates may influence the class weights, so that the latent class distribution becomes individual-specific as in the latent regression models of Bandeen-Roche et al. (1997) and Bartolucci and Forcina (2006).

In the statistical literature, Harel and Schafer (2009) proposed the use of LC models to treat cases where missingness is only partially ignorable. They introduced the concepts of *partial ignorability*, which supposes that a summary of the missing-data indicators depends on the missing values, and of *latent ignorability*, based on assuming that the missing-data indicators depend on a summary of the missing values. In the context of item responses, they proposed to create a binary missingness indicator corresponding to each item and to fit an LC model treating these indicators as additional items. In this way, each latent class does not only summarize answers to questionnaire items, but the individual propensity to answer.

In the IRT context, which is of our specific interest, several approaches may be adopted to deal with MNAR responses. The most naive ones consist of adopting simple IRT models that ignore the missing responses or consider the omissions as wrong responses. Bradlow and Thomas (1998) and Rose et al. (2010) warned against the drawbacks of these approaches, which lead to

biased estimates of model parameters and, therefore, to unfair comparisons between persons. To overcome these limitations, several authors proposed approaches based on modeling the non-ignorable missingness process. Moustaki and Knott (2000) and Moustaki and O'Muircheartaigh (2000), among others, discussed a nominal IRT model, with possible covariates for the ability, where the missing responses are treated as separate response categories, elaborating an original idea by Bock (1972). On the other hand, Rose et al. (2010) proposed a latent regression model where the latent ability is regressed on the observed response rate, referring in this way the missingness mechanism to the covariates rather than to the responses.

An interesting stream of research has been introduced by Lord (1983), who suggested to treat the problem of MNAR responses by assuming that the observed item responses depend both on the latent ability (or abilities), intended to be measured by the test, and on another latent variable which represents the "temperament" of respondents, and describes their propensity to respond. Elaborating the approach of Lord (1983), Holman and Glas (2005) discussed a unified model-based approach for handling non-ignorable missing data and, therefore, assessing the extent to which the missingness mechanism may be ignored. The adopted approach relies on multidimensional IRT models (Reckase, 2010) and on the assumption that the latent traits are normally distributed.

It is also worth recalling the work of Bertoli-Barsotti and Punzo (2013) that proposed an alternative non-parametric approach based on the conditional maximum likelihood estimation method, where a multidimensional IRT model is specified according to the Rasch model assumptions (Rasch, 1960). The main drawback of the conditional approach is that it does not allow us to measure the correlation between the assumed latent variables; moreover, its use is limited to settings for which the Rasch model is realistic.

The above mentioned approaches based on the introduction of a latent variable describing the tendency to respond are well suited to a Structural Equation Model (SEM) formulation (Goldberger, 1972; Duncan, 1975; Bollen et al., 2008), which allows for several types of generalizations (e.g., semiparametric specification of the latent trait distribution and effect of individual covariates on the latent traits).

Aim of the present article is to introduce a SEM, which reduces to a special type of multidimensional LC IRT model, to deal with non-ignorable missing responses to a set of test items. The model is based on the assumption of discreteness of the latent variables, not only for the response process but also for the missingness process. Therefore, with respect to traditional SEM, the proposed model takes the form of a finite mixture SEM (Jedidi et al., 1997; Dolan and van der Maas, 1998; Arminger et al., 1999).

The basic model we rely on was introduced by Bartolucci (2007) and it is based on two main assumptions: (*i*) more latent traits can be simultaneously considered and each item is associated with only one of them (between-item multidimensionality, see Adams et al., 1997), and (*ii*) these latent traits are represented by a random vector with a discrete distribution common to all subjects, so that each support point of such a distribution identifies a different latent class of individuals having homogenous unobservable characteristics. Moreover, with binary response variables, either a Rasch or a two-parameter logistic (2PL) parametrization (Birnbaum, 1968) may be adopted for the probability of a correct response to each item. In this context, we propose to include a further discrete latent variable to model the probability of observing a response to each item, so that the non-ignorable missing process may be treated in a semiparametric way, as made for the response process. Other than extending the model of Bartolucci (2007) to allow for missingness, we also extend it to allow for latent individual covariates which may explain the probability of belonging to a given latent class.

The approach proposed in this article joins the latent class approach of Formann (2007)

with the parametric approach of Holman and Glas (2005) developed in the IRT setting. Several advantages with respect to the last one may be found. First, the proposed model is more flexible because it does not introduce any parametric assumption about the distribution of the latent variables. Second, detecting homogenous classes of individuals is convenient for certain decisional processes, because individuals in the same class may be associated to the same decision (e.g., students admitted, admitted with reserve, not admitted to university courses). Finally, our model allows us to skip the well-known problem of the intractability of multidimensional integrals which characterizes the marginal log-likelihood function of a continuous multidimensional IRT model. Indeed, parameter estimation may be performed through the discrete marginal maximum likelihood method, based on an Expectation-Maximization (EM) algorithm (Dempster et al., 1977), and implemented in an `R` function that we make publicly available.

In order to assess the finite-sample properties of the parameter estimates obtained from the EM algorithm, we have performed a simulation study under different scenarios corresponding to different structures of missing data. In this way, we can also assess the impact of missing data on the quality of the parameter estimates with respect to the case in which all data are observed. The proposed approach is also illustrated through an application to real data coming from the Students' Entry Test given at the Faculty of Economics of an Italian university in 2011. The test is composed of 36 multiple-choice items devoted to measure three latent abilities (Logic, Mathematics, and Verbal comprehension) and certain covariates are also included.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. We first describe the proposed structural model to account for the presence of non-ignorable missing responses in the IRT context and its statistical formulation. Then, some details about the estimation procedure through the EM algorithm are described together with other details about likelihood inference. In the sequel, we illustrate the simulation study to evaluate the adequacy of the proposed approach. The application of the proposed approach to the data arising from the Students' Entry Test is illustrated in the last section.

2 Proposed SEM formulation

In this section, we describe the proposed approach to model MNAR item responses (Little and Rubin, 2002). We begin by illustrating the proposed SEM and then we provide the resulting statistical formulation which may be cast in the class of multidimensional IRT models.

2.1 Structural model

For a random subject drawn from the population of interest, denote by Y_j the response provided by the subject to binary item j, with $j = 1, \ldots, m$. In order to model the response process, we have to consider that the subject may answer correctly ($Y_j = 1$) or incorrectly ($Y_j = 0$) or he/she may skip the question, so that Y_j can be observed or not. Therefore, for $j = 1, \ldots, m$, we also introduce the binary indicator R_j equal to 1 if the individual provides a response to item j and to 0 otherwise (i.e., Y_j is missing); see also Harel and Schafer (2009). Moreover, we consider a set of c exogenous individual covariates denoted by $X_1, \ldots, X_c$.

In order to explain the association between the exogenous variables $X_1, \ldots, X_c$ and the endogenous variables $Y_1, \ldots, Y_m$, we introduce two latent variables. The first of these latent variables, denoted by U, represents the latent trait that is measured by the test items (e.g., ability in Mathematics). The second latent variable, denoted by V, is interpreted as the propensity to answer (as in Lord, 1983), the opposite of an *aversion to risk* if a wrong response is somehow penalized. Based on these latent variables and considering Y_j and R_j as deriving from a dis-

cretization of continuous variables denoted by Y_j^* and R_j^*, we formulate the following equations entering the *measurement component* of the proposed SEM:

$$\begin{aligned} Y_j &= I\{Y_j^* \geq 0\}, & (1)\\ R_j &= I\{R_j^* \geq 0\}, & (2)\\ Y_j^* &= \alpha_j U - \beta_j + \varepsilon_{1j}, & (3)\\ R_j^* &= \gamma_{1j} U + \gamma_{2j} V - \delta_j + \varepsilon_{2j}, & (4) \end{aligned}$$

for $j = 1, \ldots, m$, where $I\{\cdot\}$ is the indicator function equal to 1 if its argument is true and to 0 otherwise and ε_{1j} and ε_{2j} are independent error terms. Moreover, the slope α_j measures the effect of an increase of the latent variable U on Y_j^* and, similarly, γ_{1j} and γ_{2j} measure the effect on R_j^* of U and V, respectively.

According to the proposed model, the observed response to a given item j depends only on the latent ability U measured by the test, whereas the event of answering to item j depends both on U and on the propensity to respond V. Therefore, provided that $\gamma_{2j} > 0$, R_j^* tends to increase with the propensity to respond given the latent ability level. Similarly, provided that $\gamma_{1j} > 0$, R_j^* tends to increase with the ability level even if the propensity to answer remain constant. The idea behind this assumption is that better students are more willing to respond due to their confidence on the correctness of the response. Note that the adopted formulation reminds model G3 of Holman and Glas (2005), whereas model G2 proposed by the same authors is obtained by imposing the constraint $\gamma_{1j} = 0$, $j = 1, \ldots, m$, which implies the absence of any direct effect of U on R_j^* and, therefore, denotes that the missingness process may be ignored. Finally, β_j and δ_j denote other two parameters characterizing item j, which may be interpreted as *difficulty parameters* because higher values of them correspond to smaller values of Y_j^* and R_j^*.

The proposed SEM formulation is completed by assuming that: (i) the latent variables U and V are conditionally independent given the covariates $X_1, \ldots, X_c$ and that (ii) a direct effect of these covariates on the response variables is ruled out. How we formulate the conditional distributions of U and V given the covariates will be clarified in the following section.

The above approach may be easily extended to the multidimensional case with items measuring s different latent traits (e.g., ability in Mathematics, ability in Logic, ability in Verbal comprehension), which are represented by the latent variables $U_1, \ldots, U_s$, assuming, in addition to (1) and (2), that

$$\begin{aligned} Y_j^* &= \alpha_j \sum_{d=1}^{s} z_{dj} U_d - \beta_j + \varepsilon_{1j}, & (5)\\ R_j^* &= \gamma_{1j} \sum_{d=1}^{s} z_{dj} U_d + \gamma_{2j} V - \delta_j + \varepsilon_{2j}, & (6) \end{aligned}$$

for $j = 1, \ldots, m$. In comparison with the structural model based on equations (1)-(4), the new one changes in the last two equations involving the indicator variables z_{dj}, which are equal to 1 if item j measures latent trait of type d and to 0 otherwise. A between-item multidimensional approach (Adams et al., 1997) is assumed with reference to the measurement of the s latent abilities, indicating that each item measures only one of them. On the other hand, a within-item multidimensional approach is here adopted for the indicator R_j, since it is affected by two latent variables. In any case, our conceptual model still assumes one latent variable V for the propensity to answer (for an illustration see Figure 1). A possible alternative, which is more

complex to deal with, is represented by the introduction of s latent variables $V_1, \ldots, V_s$ for the propensity to answer, one for each latent variable $U_1, \ldots, U_s$.

FIGURE 1 HERE

2.2 Statistical model

In order to estimate the structural model outlined above, we need to formulate assumptions on the conditional distribution of the latent variables given the covariates and on the distribution of the error terms ε_{1j} and ε_{2j} in the equations for Y_j^* and R_j^*.

Regarding the first aspect, we assume that the vector of latent variables $(U_1, \ldots, U_s)'$ and V are independent, given the covariates $X_1, \ldots, X_c$, and have a discrete distribution, with k_1 support points $(u_{1h_1}, \ldots, u_{sh_1})'$, $h_1 = 1, \ldots, k_1$, and k_2 support points v_{h_2}, $h_2 = 1, \ldots, k_2$, respectively. The corresponding weights are denoted by

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{h_1}(\boldsymbol{x}) &= p(U_1 = u_{1h_1}, \ldots, U_s = u_{sh_1} | X_1 = x_1, \ldots, X_c = x_c), \quad h_1 = 1, \ldots, k_1, \\ \pi_{h_2}(\boldsymbol{x}) &= p(V = v_{h_2} | X_1 = x_1, \ldots, X_c = x_c), \quad h_2 = 1, \ldots, k_2, \end{aligned}$$

which depend on the column vector of observed individual covariates $\boldsymbol{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_c)'$. This is equivalent to assuming that individuals come from latent classes which are internally homogenous in terms of the latent traits measured by the questionnaire. Note that, with respect to traditional LC models, there is not a set of weights common to all subjects in the sample, but weights $\lambda_{h_1}(\boldsymbol{x})$ and $\pi_{h_2}(\boldsymbol{x})$ which are subject-specific, as they depend on the individual covariates. In particular, we assume the following multinomial logistic parametrization, which is similar to that adopted by Formann (2007):

$$\log \frac{\lambda_{h_1+1}(\boldsymbol{x})}{\lambda_1(\boldsymbol{x})} = \phi_{0h_1} + \boldsymbol{x}' \boldsymbol{\phi}_{1h_1}, \quad h_1 = 1, \ldots, k_1 - 1, \tag{7}$$

where ϕ_{0h_1} and $\boldsymbol{\phi}_{1h_1}$ are regression parameters to be estimated. A similar parametrization, based on regression parameters ψ_{0h_2} and $\boldsymbol{\psi}_{1h_2}$, is assumed for the conditional probabilities $\pi_{h_2}(\boldsymbol{x})$, $h_2 = 1, \ldots, k_2 - 1$.

Regarding the error terms ε_{1j} and ε_{2j}, we assume that they are independent and have a standard logistic distribution. This is a convenient assumption implying that the distribution of Y_j and R_j given the corresponding latent variables satisfies a logistic model. In particular, with

$$\begin{aligned} p_{h_1 j} &= p(Y_j = 1 | U_1 = u_{1h_1}, \ldots, U_s = u_{sh_1}), \quad h_1 = 1, \ldots, k_1 \\ q_{h_1 h_2 j} &= p(R_j = 1 | U_1 = u_{1h_1}, \ldots, U_s = u_{sh_1}, V = v_{h_2}), \quad h_2 = 1, \ldots, k_2, \end{aligned}$$

we have the following 2PL parametrization (Birnbaum, 1968):

$$\log \frac{p_{h_1 j}}{1 - p_{h_1 j}} = \alpha_j \sum_{d=1}^{s} z_{dj} u_{dh_1} - \beta_j, \quad j = 1, \ldots, m, \tag{8}$$

$$\log \frac{q_{h_1 h_2 j}}{1 - q_{h_1 h_2 j}} = \gamma_{1j} \sum_{d=1}^{s} z_{dj} u_{dh_1} + \gamma_{2j} v_{h_2} - \delta_j, \quad j = 1, \ldots, m. \tag{9}$$

Using the terminology of IRT models, α_j, γ_{1j}, and γ_{2j} are *discriminating parameters* and β_j and δ_j are *difficulty parameters*. In particular, α_j measures the discriminating power of item j,

that is, how the probability of responding correctly to the item depends on the latent ability, whereas γ_{1j} and γ_{2j} measure how the probability of responding (correctly or not) to item j depends on both latent ability and propensity to answer, respectively. A more parsimonious model is obtained by constraining all the discriminating parameters to be equal one other, that is, $\alpha_j = 1$, $\gamma_{1j} = 1$, and $\gamma_{2j} = 1$ for $j = 1, \ldots, m$. In this way a Rasch type model (Rasch, 1960) is specified.

The parametrization illustrated above may be extended to take into account general situations, such as that of differential effects of U_d on R_j^* across the latent classes $h_1 = 1, \ldots, k_1$. For this aim, we should introduce a discriminating parameter depending on the specific latent class; therefore we have to substitute γ_{1j} with γ_{1h_1j} in equation (9). However, generalizations of this type give rise to more complex models, the interpretation and estimation of which may be complicate.

The assumptions formulated in the previous section imply an assumption that in the IRT literature is known as *local independence*; see, for instance, Hambleton and Swaminathan (1985). In the present context, this assumption means that all variables $Y_1, \ldots, Y_m$ and $R_1, \ldots, R_m$ are conditionally independent given the latent vector $(U_1, \ldots, U_s, V)'$. In particular, for $j = 1, \ldots, m$, there is conditional independence between the response Y_j (observable or not) and the indicator for response R_j, given the latent variables. This condition is similar to that of non-ignorable random-coefficient-based drop out (Little, 1995).

The above assumptions imply that the proposed SEM reduces to a multidimensional IRT model similar to the model proposed by Bartolucci (2007) for the augmented set of responses $Y_1, \ldots, Y_m, R_1, \ldots, R_m$; see also Von Davier (2008). In particular, this model is characterized by the following features:

- certain response variable Y_j may be missing at random (given also $R_1, \ldots, R_m$), whereas the variables R_j are always observed;
- every Y_j depends on a specific latent variable U_{d_j} through a Rasch or a 2PL parametrization, whereas R_j depends on both U_{d_j} and another latent variable V, being d_j the dimension measured by item j (i.e., $z_{dj} = 1$ if $d = d_j$ and $z_{dj} = 0$ otherwise);
- the latent variables $U_1, \ldots, U_s$ and V have a discrete distribution depending on the individual covariates $X_1, \ldots, X_c$ through a multinomial logistic model.

Consequently, for a vector of observed responses $\boldsymbol{y}_{obs}$, which is a subvector of $(y_1, \ldots, y_m)'$, and a realization $\boldsymbol{r} = (r_1, \ldots, r_m)'$ of $R_1, \ldots, R_m$, we have the *manifest distribution*:

$$\begin{aligned} p(\boldsymbol{y}_{obs}, \boldsymbol{r}|\boldsymbol{x}) &= \sum_{h_1=1}^{k_1} \sum_{h_2=1}^{k_2} \lambda_{h_1}(\boldsymbol{x}) \pi_{h_2}(\boldsymbol{x}) p_{h_1h_2}(\boldsymbol{y}_{obs}, \boldsymbol{r}|\boldsymbol{x}), \qquad (10) \\ p_{h_1h_2}(\boldsymbol{y}_{obs}, \boldsymbol{r}) &= \prod_{j=1\,(r_j=1)}^{m} p_{h_1j}^{y_j} (1 - p_{h_1j})^{1-y_j} \prod_{j=1}^{m} q_{h_2j}^{r_j} (1 - q_{h_2j})^{1-r_j}, \end{aligned}$$

where the first product is extended to all items j for which a response is observed, and then $r_j = 1$. In fact, this model has a number of free parameters equal to

$$\#\text{par} = (k_1 + k_2 - 2)(c + 1) + sk_1 + k_2 + 2m - (s + 1) + I\{a = 1\}[3m - (s + 1)],$$

where $s + 1$ is the total number of latent variables, $a = 0$ for the Rasch model, and $a = 1$ for to the 2PL model. In fact, there are $k_1 + k_2 - 2$ regression coefficients for the latent classes for each

of the c covariates plus one intercept, $sk_1 + k_2$ ability parameters, $3m - (s+1)$ discriminating parameters (when $a = 1$), and $2m - (s+1)$ difficulty parameters. In fact, $s+1$ difficulty parameters must be constrained to 0 and $s+1$ discriminating parameters must be constrained to 1 to ensure model identifiability.

3 Likelihood inference

The parameters of the proposed model, which are collected in the vector $\boldsymbol{\eta}$, may be estimated through the discrete marginal maximum likelihood approach, making use of the EM algorithm (Dempster et al., 1977). For a sample of n subjects, the model log-likelihood is defined as

$$\ell(\boldsymbol{\eta}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \log p(\boldsymbol{y}_{i,obs}, \boldsymbol{r}_i | \boldsymbol{x}_i),$$

where $\boldsymbol{y}_{i,obs}$ is the vector of observed responses for subject i, $\boldsymbol{r}_i$ is the corresponding vector of indicators of response, $\boldsymbol{x}_i$ is the vector of covariates for this subject, and $p(\boldsymbol{y}_{i,obs}, \boldsymbol{r}_i | \boldsymbol{x}_i)$ is defined in (10).

In order to maximize $\ell(\boldsymbol{\eta})$, the EM algorithm alternates two steps until convergence:

E-step: compute the expected value of the so-called *complete data log-likelihood* given the current parameter vector; this function is defined as

$$\ell^*(\boldsymbol{\eta}) = \sum_{h_1=1}^{k_1} \sum_{h_2=1}^{k_2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_{h_1 h_2 i} \log[\lambda_{h_1}(\boldsymbol{x}_i) \pi_{h_2}(\boldsymbol{x}_i)] + \sum_{h_1=1}^{k_1} \sum_{h_2=1}^{k_2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_{h_1 h_2 i} \log p_{h_1 h_2}(\boldsymbol{y}_{i,obs}, \boldsymbol{r}_i),$$

where $w_{h_1 h_2 i}$ is an indicator variable equal to 1 if subject i belongs to latent class h_1 (with respect to the latent variables $U_1, \ldots, U_s$) and h_2 (with respect to the latent variable V) and it is equal to 0 otherwise. Note that in this case the missing data are referred to values of the latent variables of interest. Then, the E-step consists of computing the conditional posterior probabilities

$$\hat{w}_{h_1 h_2 i} = \frac{\lambda_{h_1}(\boldsymbol{x}_i) \pi_{h_2}(\boldsymbol{x}_i) p_{h_1 h_2}(\boldsymbol{y}_{i,obs}, \boldsymbol{r}_i)}{\sum_{t_1=1}^{k_1} \sum_{t_2=1}^{k_2} \lambda_{t_1}(\boldsymbol{x}_i) \pi_{t_2}(\boldsymbol{x}_i) p_{t_1 t_2}(\boldsymbol{y}_{i,obs}, \boldsymbol{r}_i)},$$

for $h_1 = 1, \ldots, k_1$, $h_2 = 1, \ldots, k_2$, and $i = 1, \ldots, n$.

M-step: maximize the expected value of $\ell^*(\boldsymbol{\eta})$ obtained at the E-step with respect to $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ so that these parameters are updated. This requires to use suitable iterative algorithms of Newton-Raphson type also for the parameters affecting the class weights; see Bartolucci and Forcina (2006) and Bartolucci (2007) for details.

The algorithm used for the application is implemented in an `R` function, related to the package `MultiLCIRT`[1]; this function and the syntax we use are downloadable from `http://www.stat.unipg.it/bartolucci/irt_missing.zip`. Note that similar analyses may be performed by means of `Latent GOLD` (Vermunt and Magidson, 2005) or `Mplus` (Muthén and Muthén, 2012) softwares, which allow for multidimensional IRT models, discrete latent traits, MAR data, and individual covariates.

[1] Downloadable from `http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=MultiLCIRT`.

In order to measure the uncertainty about these estimates through standard errors (and confidence intervals), we also implemented a non-parametric bootstrap method (Davison and Hinkley, 1997), based on drawing with replacement B samples of dimension n from the observed data. A multidimensional LC IRT model with the same characteristics as the selected model is then estimated for each bootstrap sample and the corresponding quantities of interest are stored. In this way, an empirical distribution is obtained, on the basis of which the standard errors (and confidence intervals) may be calculated for every parameter estimate of interest. Note that the described approach requires some caution. In particular, as the ordering of latent classes may change from sample to sample, it has to be fixed on the basis of some criteria, such as on the basis of the estimated supported points. We also outline that the bootstrap resampling procedure is distribution-free; therefore, it allows us to preserve the advantages of our semi-parametric approach and it represents a simple method to estimate standard errors having a complicated distribution.

Finally, it is important to recall that the specific LC IRT model that is adopted depends on the chosen number of latent classes (k_1 and k_2), the chosen number of latent dimensions (s), and the chosen parametrization of the conditional response probabilities (Rasch or 2PL). Therefore, a model selection procedure is usually required in applications involving a certain dataset, unless theoretical considerations do not suggest specific choices, such as a given number of latent classes. For this aim, we suggest to use a likelihood ratio test when the compared models are nested and the usual regularity conditions are met or, more in general, an information criterion, especially in the presence of non-nested models.

Different information criteria have been proposed in the statistical literature. Among the best known, there are the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC, Akaike, 1973) and the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC, Schwarz, 1978). In particular, we suggest to use BIC, which is based on the minimization of the index: $BIC = -2\hat{\ell} + \log(n)\#\text{par}$, where $\hat{\ell}$ is the maximum log-likelihood estimate of the model of interest.

In contrast with AIC, BIC takes into account the sample size, so that it uses a larger penalty for the model complexity (measured in terms of number of parameters), and it is asymptotically consistent for finite mixture models under certain regularity conditions (Keribin, 2000). In particular, BIC tends to select more parsimonious models than AIC. For a detailed description of AIC and BIC we refer the reader to Burnham and Anderson (2002) and Yang (2005), among others. In the context of finite mixture models and LC models, several studies are aimed at comparing the performance of different information criteria for model selection. We consider, in particular, Fraley and Raftery (2002), who used BIC for clustering in mixture models showing its satisfactory behavior, and Dias (2006), who compared different selection criteria specifically in the context of LC models; see also McLachlan and Peel (2000), Ch. 8.

4 Simulation study

This section illustrates the Monte Carlo simulation experiment we implemented in order to study the finite-sample properties of the maximum likelihood estimates of the proposed model. In this way, we can also evaluate empirically the adequacy of the proposed approach in obtaining reliable estimates of the model parameters and in showing the presence of a non-ignorable missing mechanism for the item responses.

4.1 Simulation setting

The simulation study is based on a model with two latent abilities, U_1 and U_2, which drive the observed responses, and another latent construct, V, which corresponds to the tendency to respond. The distribution of these latent variables is based on $k_1 = k_2 = 3$ latent classes

with probabilities affected by two individual covariates, X_1 and X_2, generated from independent standard normal distributions. For the sample size we considered $n = 1000, 2000$ and for the number of items $m = 20, 40$. The items are equally distributed between U_1 and U_2, so that the first $m/2$ items are assumed to measure the first latent variable and the second $m/2$ items are assumed to measure the second latent variable. Moreover, we assumed three types of scenario: (i) complete cases (with no missing responses), (ii) presence of missing responses depending on V, and (iii) presence of missing responses depending on V and on U_1 and U_2. In this way, we considered a total of 12 different scenarios, which are listed in Table 1, under each of which 1000 samples have been simulated.

TABLE 1 HERE

All the proposed scenarios assume fixed values of the population parameters. In particular, the regression coefficients ϕ_{jh} of the multinomial logistic model for U_1 and U_2 are such that covariate X_1 has not effect on the distribution of the latent classes ($\phi_{11} = \phi_{12} = 0$), whereas covariate X_2 has effect only on the logit for class 2 versus class 1 ($\phi_{21} = 1$ and $\phi_{22} = 0$). Then, the intercepts of the model are chosen so that the average weight of the second latent class ($\bar{\lambda}_2$) is equal to 0.5, whereas the weights of the other two classes ($\bar{\lambda}_1$, $\bar{\lambda}_3$) are equal to 0.25. Finally, regarding the multinomial logistic model for V we assumed $\psi_{jh_2} = \phi_{jh_1}$ for $h_1, h_2 = 1, 2$ and $j = 0, 1, 2$; consequently the average weight of the second class ($\bar{\lambda}_2$) is again equal to 0.5, whereas the average weights of the other two classes ($\bar{\pi}_1$, $\bar{\pi}_3$) are equal to 0.25. Moreover, the support points u_{dh_1} and v_{h_2}, with $d = 1, 2$ and $h_1, h_2 = 1, 2, 3$, are chosen so that all latent variables have mean 0 and variance 1 and U_1 and U_2 are positively correlated, similarly to the situation illustrated in our application based on the Students' Entry Test.

Concerning the item parameters, the difficulties β_j correspond to sequence of equally spaced points between -2 and 2; the first $m/2$ parameters refer to items of U_1 and the remaining $m/2$ to those of U_2. In this way, there are items with increasing difficulties in both dimensions and the discriminating parameters α_j increase from 1 to 2 for U_1 and decrease from 2 to 1 for U_2. Therefore, four different types of items are considered: items with high β_j and high α_j, items with low β_j and low α_j, items with high β_j and low α_j, and items with low β_j and high α_j.

Finally, we set constant values for δ_j and γ_{2j} for $j = 1, \ldots, m$, whereas $\gamma_{1j} = 0$ for $j = 1, \ldots, m$ if the missingness depends only on V and $\gamma_{1j} = 1$ for $j = 1, \ldots, m$ if it depends also on U_1 and U_2.

4.2 Simulation results

A bidimensional model with $k_1 = k_2 = 3$ latent classes and a 2PL parametrization were estimated for every simulated sample generated under each of the 12 scenarios. Tables 2, 3, and 4 show the main results of the simulation study, with reference to the estimates of the support points, the regression coefficients, and the item parameters, respectively. In particular, we report the values of the bias and of the root-mean-square-error (RMSE) for each population parameter; for sake of parsimony, we show the average (absolute) value of bias and RMSE for the item parameters.

TABLES 2, 3 AND 4 HERE

We observe generally satisfactorily values of both bias and RMSE. We also observe that bias is approximately constant, regardless of the type of scenario. On the other hand, some

differences emerge relatively to RMSE. In fact, as may be expected, the RMSE decreases when the number of items m and the sample size n increase, as it is evident by comparing scenarios 1 vs 7, 2 vs 8, and so on for m, and 1 vs 4, 2 vs 5, and so on for n.

Concerning the trend of RMSE depending on the changes in the missingness structure, we observe that the presence or absence of missing item responses does not modify the values of RMSE in case of regression coefficients, whereas RMSE computed for the item parameters and, though to a lower extent, for the support points is constantly smaller in absence of missingness rather than in its presence (Tables 2 and 4, respectively). Moreover, some differences emerge by changing the type of missingness dependence. When missing item responses depend only by V, RMSE values for the support points of latent distributions (compare scenarios 2 vs 3, 5 vs 6, and 8 vs 9 in Table 2) are higher, those for the regression coefficients tend to be similar, and RMSE values for item parameters are similar or smaller (compare scenarios 5 vs 6 and 11 vs 12 in Table 4) rather than when missing item responses depend also on U_1 and U_2.

Finally, a special attention must be paid to the results about the discriminant parameters γ_{1j}. As shown in Table 4, parameters γ_{1j} are well estimated both when the missingness process depends only on the latent trait V (scenarios 2, 5, 8, and 11) and when it depends also on the abilities U_d, $d = 1, 2$ (scenarios 3, 6, 9, and 12). Therefore, the proposed model allows us to obtain evidence about the effect of the latent abilities on the missing responses and to properly conclude about the ignorability of the missingness process. In practice, discriminant parameter estimates $\hat{\gamma}_{1j}$ not significantly different from zero for all items denote that the presence of missing responses does not depend on the abilities, whereas values of $\hat{\gamma}_{1j}$ significantly different from 0 (for at least some items) denote that the missing data provides information about the abilities and, accordingly, it cannot be ignored.

5 Application to Students' Entry Test

In the following, we first provide a description of the dataset on which the application is based and then we illustrate the main aspects of the estimated model, with special attention to the results concerning the model selection procedure, the estimated latent structure, and the estimated item parameters, even in comparison with the results obtained assuming ignorable missing responses.

5.1 Data description

The dataset contains the responses provided by 1217 students to an Entry Test for the Faculty of Economics of an Italian university in 2011. The test is organized in three disciplinary sections concerning the measurement of the same number of abilities represented here by latent variables: Logic (13 items, measuring latent variable U_1), Mathematics (13 items, measuring latent variable U_2), and Verbal comprehension (10 items, measuring latent variable U_3). Following the proposed approach, we also considered a further latent variable, V, describing the propensity to answer, which is assumed to be independent of $(U_1, U_2, U_3)'$ given the individual covariates. The dataset also contains individual information about three covariates: gender (0 = male, 1 = female), type of secondary school diploma (0 = classical or scientific diploma, 1 = technical or professional diploma), and secondary school final mark (in 100ths).

All items are of multiple choice type, with one correct answer and four distractors. The recorded data are about the correctness or incorrectness of the provided response. However, since a wrong response penalizes the score more than a response that is not provided, many missing responses exist in the dataset, whose distribution differs both within the three disciplinary sections and between the sections themselves. In average, the percentage of missing responses is equal to 8.9% for Verbal comprehension, 14.6% for Logic, and 38.5% for Mathematics, whereas the percentage of right responses is equal to 73.8%, 59.9%, and 41.1%, respectively.

5.2 Model selection

To analyze the data described above, we initially considered the proposed model with $k_1 = k_2 = 3$ latent classes and a Rasch and a 2PL parametrization. The first model, denoted by M_1, has a maximum-likelihood equal to $\hat{\ell} = -33528.28$ and $BIC = 67738.55$. For the second model, denoted by M_2, we have $\hat{\ell} = -32974.23$ and $BIC = 67369.29$. Therefore, the deviance (likelihood ratio statistic) between the two models is equal to 1108.09 with 104 degrees of freedom leading to reject the Rasch parametrization in favor of the 2PL parametrization. This is also confirmed by the lower value of BIC for M_2 than for M_1.

Then we fitted a third model (M_3) that is a restricted version of model M_2 in which the abilities do not affect the probability to respond, and then in equation (6) we have $\gamma_{1j} = 0$, $j = 1, \ldots, m$. For model M_3 we have $\hat{\ell} = -33256.2$ and $BIC = 67677.48$. The deviance between models M_2 and M_3, equal to 563.93 with 36 degrees of freedom, and the corresponding values of BIC lead to the conclusion that M_3 cannot be accepted and then there is evidence that the different abilities affect the probability to respond to the test items. In this way we respond to the main scientific question behind the present application, that is, whether there is an influence of the abilities measured by the test items on the probability of responding.

We recall that the above results are based on the assumption that $k_1 = k_2 = 3$. The choice $k_1 = 3$ is motivated by the necessity of distinguishing students admitted, admitted with reserve, and not admitted to university courses in Economics. Concerning k_2, we verified that BIC suggests $k_2 > 1$, giving some evidence about the presence of a distinct latent trait (V) other than the abilities U_1, U_2, and U_3. In fact, with $k_1 = 3$ and $k_2 = 1$, under the same parametrization of model M_2 we obtain $\hat{\ell} = -33989.46$ and $BIC = 69080.07$, which is much higher than the value found with $k_2 = 3$.

We also verified that the main conclusions of the study are substantially unaffected by the specific number of latent classes that is selected and then we retained k_1 and k_2 equal to 3, also to simplify the interpretation of the results.

5.3 Estimated latent structure

In order to further study the response mechanism of interest in the present application, in Table 5 we report the distribution of the latent variables, with support points which are denoted by $\hat{u}^*_{dh_1}$ and $\hat{v}^*_{h_2}$, which are standardized so that each latent distribution has mean 0 and variance 1. In Table 6 we also report the estimated correlation coefficients together with the standard errors based on 199 non-parametric bootstrap samples. We recall that these estimates are obtained under model M_2, that is, the model with 2PL parametrization and covariates affecting the latent distribution, which is based on $k_1 = k_2 = 3$ support points.

TABLES 5 AND 6 HERE

Concerning the estimated distribution of abilities measured by the test items, we observe that the latent classes are increasingly ordered for each dimension. Moreover, for each dimension, such a distribution is roughly symmetric, with the support point for the second class close to 0 (corresponding to the mean) and the support points for the first and the third classes which are almost equally distant from 0. The second class has the highest weight (45.2%), whereas the other two classes have a similar weight. On the other hand, for the latent variable representing the tendency to respond, the distribution is far from being symmetric, since there is a small group of subjects, those in the third class, with a high tendency to respond. The other subjects (87%) are in the first two classes and have a low or moderate tendency to respond. Note that

the distance between the first and the second class is around one half of the distance between the second and the third.

Finally, in Table 7 we report the estimated regression coefficients of the multinomial logistic models which relates the distribution of the latent variables above with the covariates; see assumption (7).

TABLE 7 HERE

It is worth noting that all covariates have a significant effect on the distribution of the latent classes for the abilities, with females and students having classical or scientific high school diploma that tend to be in classes of lower ability with respect to males and students having technical or professional school diploma, respectively. It is also observed that the probability of belonging to the higher ability classes increases with the final mark. Another important aspect that may be observed on the basis of the estimates in Table 7 is that no covariate has a clearly significant effect on the distribution of the latent variable V and then on the tendency to respond. From the scientific point of view we then conclude that, differently from the abilities, this tendency is rather unpredictable on the basis of the covariates, being related to aspects of the student's personality that are not directly observable.

5.4 Estimated item parameters

Another relevant set of estimates to consider is that of the item parameters, which enter in the structural equations (5) and (6) and then in the logistic equations (8) and (9) for the distribution of the response variables given the latent variables. These estimates are reported in Table 8 together with the bootstrap standard errors.

TABLE 8 HERE

The first important aspect to consider is that almost all discriminant indices for the abilities (α_j) are significantly different from 0 and positive, with the exception of two items, which are in two distinct sections (Mathematics and Verbal comprehension). In particular, the first of these items is the number 20, for that $\hat{\alpha}_{20} = -0.022$, whereas the second is the number 29, for that $\hat{\alpha}_{29} = 0.089$. These results are rather plausible, since the first of these items has a very low proportion of right answers (5.85%) and the second has a very high proportion of right answers (76.0%) and then they do not provide an adequate discrimination between less and more capable students. Moreover, the first is the most difficult item according to the results in Table 8 ($\hat{\beta}_{20} = 1.966$). On the other hand, the item with the highest discriminant index is the number 24, which has an intermediate proportion of right responses (49.0%). It is also worth noting that many other items have high values of the discriminant index, and then they provide adequate measures of the ability.

On the basis of the results in Table 8 we can also deal with one of the main scientific questions behind the present application. In particular, once we have established that at least for some items the probability of responding depends on the ability (see previous section about the preference of model M_2 compared to model M_3), we can verify if this is true for all items or not on the basis of the estimates of the parameters γ_{1j}. We note that there are 14 items for which this coefficient is significantly different from 0 and in all these cases the estimate is positive. Therefore, we conclude that a missing response to one of these items may be interpreted as a sign of low ability level and then this missing response is reasonable to be penalized in scoring

the questionnaire. Another relevant aspect is that 10 of these 14 items belong to the section of questionnaire about Mathematics, whereas only 3 belong to the section about Logic and only 1 belongs to the last section about Verbal comprehension. This means that the dependence of the probability to respond on the ability is particularly evident for the items about Mathematics, whereas much less evident for those about Verbal comprehension.

Finally, the estimates of the discriminant indices γ_{2j} allow us to conclude that V is an adequate representation of the tendency to respond (independently of the ability level). In fact, these parameters are significantly different from 0 and have a positive estimate for 32 items on 36. The interpretation of the single values of these estimates is similar to that of the estimates of discriminant indices α_j relating the ability level to the probability of responding correctly.

5.5 Comparison with the missing at random approach

As suggested by the results about the statistical significance of discriminant parameters γ_{1j} described in the previous section, we conclude that missing responses are informative about the abilities measured by the test. To further investigate about this issue we have estimated a multidimensional LC IRT model under the assumption of ignorable missingness and we can compare the results with those obtained through our approach which takes the missingness mechanism explicitly into account. Here we present the main results related with the multidimensional LC 2PL model with $k_1 = 3$ latent classes and $s = 3$ latent variables (U_1, U_2, and U_3), being omitted the tendency to answer (V).

Obviously, the MAR approach does not allow to get information about the missingness mechanism and to characterize the latent classes in terms of probability of answering. Moreover, the consequences about the inferential conclusions and about the evaluation of individuals are far from trivial.

First, even if we do not observe any sensible difference under the estimates of the support points (results are here omitted), the MAR assumption causes a different allocation of individuals among the latent classes. Indeed, ordering the latent classes according to the support points, we note that the estimated average weight for class 2 under MAR assumption is higher than the corresponding value under MNAR assumption ($\hat{\tilde{\lambda}}_2$ equals 0.548 and 0.452, respectively), whereas the estimated average weight for class 3 is lower ($\hat{\tilde{\lambda}}_3$ equals 0.189 and 0.280, respectively).

Second, we also note some relevant differences about the estimates of difficulty parameters, $\hat{\beta}_j$. Comparing results in the last two columns of Table 8 (i.e., $\tilde{\alpha}_j$ and $\tilde{\beta}_j$) with values $\hat{\alpha}_j$ and $\hat{\beta}_j$, we observe several values quite different under the two assumptions. In particular, more unstable estimates are obtained under the MAR approach, as shown by values for items $j = 20$ and $j = 29$, where the presence of a very high number of missing responses does not allow to reliably evaluate the difficulty of the corresponding items. Moreover, the estimates for β_j are less accurate under the MAR approach, being the standard errors always higher when the missingness mechanism is ignored.

5.6 Conclusions

From the scientific point of view, the main conclusions of the application are the following:

1. There is a set of items (mostly concentrated in the section about Mathematics) for which the probability to respond significantly depends on the ability and, therefore, it is reasonable to penalize a missing response to these items in scoring the questionnaire.

2. For the other items (sections about Logic and Verbal comprehension) the probability of responding has a weak dependence on the ability that is measured.

3. The tendency to respond, considered as a distinct latent variable with respect to the abilities, has a distribution with a shape different from that of the measured abilities. This distribution is asymmetric, with a reduced number of subjects having a very high tendency to respond.

4. The distribution of the tendency to respond has a weak dependence on individual covariates, as it is related to aspects of the personality that are difficult to be predicted on the basis of observable covariates; on the other hand, the same covariates have a significant effect on the distribution of the abilities.

5. The alternative simple approach based on ignoring the missing responses modifies the main inferential conclusions about (*i*) the allocation of individuals to the latent classes and (*ii*) the stability and accuracy of the estimates of the difficulty item parameters.

References

Adams, R. J., Wilson, M. R., and Wang, W.-C. (1997). The multidimensional random coefficients multinomial logit. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 21:1–23.

Akaike, H. (1973). Information theory and an extension of the maximum likelihood principle. In Petrov, B. N. and Caski, F., editors, *Proceeding of the Second International Symposium on Information Theory*, pages 267–281, Budapest. Akademiai Kiado.

Arminger, G., Stein, P., and Wittenberg, J. (1999). Mixtures of conditional mean- and covariance-structure models. *Psychometrika*, 64:475–494.

Bandeen-Roche, K., Miglioretti, D. L., Zeger, S. L., and Rathouz, P. J. (1997). Latent variable regression for multiple discrete outcomes. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 92(440):1375–1386.

Bartolucci, F. (2007). A class of multidimensional IRT models for testing unidimensionality and clustering items. *Psychometrika*, 72:141–157.

Bartolucci, F. and Forcina, A. (2006). A class of latent marginal models for capture-recapture data with continuous covariates. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 101:786–794.

Bertoli-Barsotti, L. and Punzo, A. (2013). Rasch analysis for binary data with nonignorable nonresponses. *Psicologica*, 34:97–123.

Birnbaum, A. (1968). Some latent trait models and their use in inferring an examinee's ability. In Lord, F. M. and Novick, M. R., editors, *Statistical Theories of Mental Test Scores*, pages 395–479. Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA.

Bock, R. D. (1972). Estimating item parameters and latent ability when responses are scored in two or more nominal categories. *Psychometrika*, 37:29–51.

Bollen, K. A., Rabe-Hesketh, S., and Skrondal, A. (2008). Structural equation models. In Box-Steffensmeier, J. M., Brady, H., and Collier, D., editors, *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology*, chapter Structural equation models, pages 432–455. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Bradlow, E. T. and Thomas, N. (1998). Item response theory models applied to data allowing examinee choice. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics*, 23:236–243.

Burnham, K. P. and Anderson, D. R. (2002). *Model Selection and Multimodel Inference: A Practical Information-Theoretic Approach*. Springer-Verlag, New York.

Davison, A. C. and Hinkley, D. V. (1997). *Bootstrap methods and their application*. Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, New York.

Dempster, A. P., Laird, N. M., and Rubin, D. B. (1977). Maximum likelihood from incomplete data via the EM algorithm (with discussion). *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society B*, 39:1–38.

Dias, J. G. (2006). Model selection for the binary latent class model: a Monte Carlo simulation. In Batagelj, V., Bock, H.-H., Ferligoj, A., and Žiberna, A., editors, *Data science and classification*, pages 91–99. Springer, Berlin.

Diggle, P. and Kenward, M. G. (1994). Informative drop-out in longitudinal data analysis (with discussion). *Applied Statistics*, 43:49–93.

Dolan, C. V. and van der Maas, H. L. J. (1998). Fitting multivariate normal finite mixtures subject to structural equation modeling. *Psychometrika*, 63:227–253.

Duncan, O. D. (1975). *Introduction to structural equation models*. Academic Press, New York.

Formann, A. K. (2007). Mixture analysis of multivariate categorical data with covariates and missing entries. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 51:5236–5246.

Fraley, C. and Raftery, A. E. (2002). Model-based clustering, discriminant analysis, and density estimation. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 97:611–631.

Goldberger, A. S. (1972). Structural equation methods in the social sciences. *Econometrica*, 40:979–1001.

Goodman, L. A. (1974). Exploratory latent structure analysis using both identifiable and unidentifiable models. *Biometrika*, 61:215–231.

Hambleton, R. K. and Swaminathan, H. (1985). *Item Response Theory: Principles and Applications*. Kluwer Nijhoff Publishing, Boston.

Harel, O. and Schafer, J. L. (2009). Partial and latent ignorability in missing-data problems. *Biometrika*, 96:37–50.

Holman, R. and Glas, C. A. (2005). Modelling non-ignorable missing-data mechanisms with item response theory models. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology*, 58:1–17.

Jedidi, K., Jagpal, H. S., and DeSarbo, W. S. (1997). STEMM: a general finite mixture structural equation model. *Journal of Classification*, 14:23–50.

Keribin, C. (2000). Consistent estimation of the order of mixture models. *Sankhyā: The Indian Journal of Statistics, Series A*, 62:49–66.

Lazarsfeld, P. F. and Henry, N. W. (1968). *Latent Structure Analysis*. Houghton Mifflin, Boston.

Little, R. J. A. (1993). Pattern-mixture models for multivariate incomplete data. *Journal of American Statistical Association*, 88:125–134.

Little, R. J. A. (1995). Modeling the drop-out mechanism in repeated-measures studies. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 90:1112–1121.

Little, R. J. A. and Rubin, D. B. (2002). *Statistical Analysis with Missing Data*. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics. Wiley, Hoboken, 2nd edition.

Lord, F. M. (1983). Maximum likelihood estimation of item response parameters when some responses are omitted. *Psychometrika*, 48:477–482.

McLachlan, G. and Peel, D. (2000). *Finite mixture models*. Wiley, New York.

Moustaki, I. and Knott, M. (2000). Weighting for item non-response in attitude scales by using latent variable models with covariates. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society A*, 163:445–459.

Moustaki, I. and O'Muircheartaigh, C. (2000). A one dimension latent trait model to infer attitude from non response for nominal data. *Statistica*, 60:259–276.

Muthén, L. K. and Muthén, B. O. (2012). *Mplus user's guide*. Los Angeles, CA, Muthén & Muthén edition.

Rasch, G. (1960). *Probabilistic models for some intelligence and attainment tests*. Danish Institute for Educational Research, Copenhagen.

Reckase, M. D. (2010). *Multidimensional Item Response Theory*. Springer, New York.

Rose, N., Von Davier, M., and Xu, X. (2010). Modeling nonignorable missing data with Item Response Theory IRT. Technical report, ETS Research Report No. RR-10-10, Princeton.

Schwarz, G. (1978). Estimating the dimension of a model. *Annals of Statistics*, 6:461–464.

Vermunt, J. K. and Magidson, J. (2005). *Latent GOLD 4.0 user's guide*. Statistical Innovations Inc., Belmont, Massachusetts.

Von Davier, M. (2008). A general diagnostic model applied to language testing data. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology*, 61:287–307.

Yang, Y. (2005). Can the strengths of AIC and BIC be shared? *Biometrika*, 92:937–950.

Figure 1: *Proposed SEM for only one covariate ($c = 1$), four items ($m = 4$), and two dimensions ($s = 2$), with the first two items measuring the first dimension and the other two items measuring the second dimension.*



Table 1: *Description of the simulated scenarios by sample size (n), number of items (m), presence of missing item responses (yes/no), and type of dependence of missingness on latent traits (U_1, U_2, V).*

Scenario	n	m	missing item responses		Scenario	n	m	missing item responses	
			presence	dependence on				presence	dependence on
1	1000	20	no	–	7	1000	40	no	–
2	1000	20	yes	V	8	1000	40	yes	V
3	1000	20	yes	U_1, U_2, V	9	1000	40	yes	U_1, U_2, V
4	2000	20	no	–	10	2000	40	no	–
5	2000	20	yes	V	11	2000	40	yes	V
6	2000	20	yes	U_1, U_2, V	12	2000	40	yes	U_1, U_2, V

Table 2: *Bias and RMSE for the estimates of the support points of the latent distributions.*

		Latent class (h_1, h_2)			Latent class (h_1, h_2)			Latent class (h_1, h_2)		
		1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
		Scenario 1			Scenario 2			Scenario 3		
u_{1h_1}	bias	-0.003	-0.001	-0.002	-0.002	0.001	-0.001	-0.008	-0.001	-0.003
	RMSE	0.061	0.035	0.037	0.065	0.038	0.044	0.062	0.036	0.037
u_{2h_1}	bias	-0.001	-0.002	-0.002	0.002	-0.001	0.002	-0.001	-0.002	0.001
	RMSE	0.037	0.035	0.059	0.042	0.038	0.063	0.037	0.036	0.062
v_{h_2}	bias	–	–	–	0.002	-0.005	0.005	0.002	-0.004	0.005
	RMSE	–	–	–	0.053	0.055	0.094	0.055	0.057	0.076
		Scenario 4			Scenario 5			Scenario 6		
u_{1h_1}	bias	-0.003	0.000	-0.001	-0.001	0.000	0.001	-0.001	0.000	0.001
	RMSE	0.043	0.024	0.026	0.044	0.026	0.030	0.042	0.025	0.026
u_{2h_1}	bias	0.000	-0.001	0.001	0.000	0.001	0.003	0.001	-0.001	0.002
	RMSE	0.026	0.024	0.042	0.032	0.026	0.043	0.027	0.024	0.043
v_{h_2}	bias	–	–	–	0.001	-0.003	0.003	0.001	-0.002	0.001
	RMSE	–	–	–	0.037	0.039	0.064	0.041	0.040	0.054
		Scenario 7			Scenario 8			Scenario 9		
u_{1h_1}	bias	-0.001	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.002	-0.002	0.001	-0.001
	RMSE	0.056	0.031	0.028	0.058	0.032	0.032	0.056	0.029	0.028
u_{2h_1}	bias	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.002	0.001	0.006	0.001	0.000	0.003
	RMSE	0.029	0.030	0.057	0.032	0.032	0.061	0.028	0.029	0.054
v_{h_2}	bias	–	–	–	0.002	-0.002	0.005	0.000	-0.004	0.004
	RMSE	–	–	–	0.042	0.037	0.058	0.044	0.038	0.050
		Scenario 10			Scenario 11			Scenario 12		
u_{1h_1}	bias	-0.003	-0.001	-0.001	-0.003	-0.002	0.000	-0.004	-0.001	-0.001
	RMSE	0.042	0.022	0.021	0.041	0.022	0.022	0.044	0.022	0.021
u_{2h_1}	bias	-0.001	-0.001	-0.001	-0.002	-0.001	-0.002	-0.001	-0.001	0.000
	RMSE	0.020	0.022	0.040	0.022	0.022	0.041	0.020	0.023	0.043
v_{h_2}	bias	–	–	–	0.001	-0.002	0.001	0.001	-0.001	0.003
	RMSE	–	–	–	0.031	0.026	0.038	0.032	0.028	0.036

Table 3: *Bias and RMSE for the estimates of regression parameters of the constant term, X_1, and X_2.*

		Regression parameters		Regression parameters				Regression parameters			
		ϕ_{j1}	ϕ_{j2}	ϕ_{j1}	ϕ_{j2}	ψ_{j1}	ψ_{j2}	ϕ_{j1}	ϕ_{j2}	ψ_{j1}	ψ_{j2}
		Scenario 1		Scenario 2				Scenario 3			
Const. ($j=0$)	Bias	0.003	0.008	0.004	0.003	-0.001	-0.004	0.012	0.007	-0.001	-0.005
	RMSE	0.093	0.103	0.098	0.105	0.121	0.177	0.094	0.105	0.127	0.170
X_1 ($j=1$)	Bias	0.000	-0.002	-0.004	-0.004	0.001	-0.001	-0.001	-0.003	0.000	0.003
	RMSE	0.088	0.090	0.087	0.096	0.106	0.105	0.088	0.090	0.117	0.109
X_2 ($j=2$)	Bias	0.008	0.008	0.011	0.008	0.020	-0.004	0.009	0.001	0.024	-0.006
	RMSE	0.102	0.104	0.105	0.105	0.137	0.133	0.102	0.102	0.151	0.132
		Scenario 4		Scenario 5				Scenario 6			
Const. ($j=0$)	Bias	0.003	0.003	0.003	-0.001	-0.001	0.000	0.004	0.000	-0.002	-0.002
	RMSE	0.063	0.070	0.064	0.074	0.083	0.124	0.063	0.075	0.095	0.121
X_1 ($j=1$)	Bias	-0.001	0.001	-0.003	0.000	0.002	0.001	-0.002	-0.004	0.001	0.000
	RMSE	0.061	0.063	0.065	0.066	0.076	0.071	0.062	0.064	0.076	0.076
X_2 ($j=2$)	Bias	0.003	0.002	0.000	0.001	0.007	-0.001	0.004	0.002	0.011	-0.004
	RMSE	0.071	0.070	0.074	0.075	0.093	0.094	0.072	0.071	0.101	0.095
		Scenario 7		Scenario 8				Scenario 9			
Const. ($j=0$)	Bias	0.000	0.001	0.003	-0.004	0.001	-0.003	0.004	-0.002	0.008	0.003
	RMSE	0.084	0.097	0.088	0.102	0.090	0.118	0.084	0.093	0.093	0.113
X_1 ($j=1$)	Bias	0.005	0.000	-0.002	0.003	-0.002	0.000	0.002	0.000	-0.002	0.008
	RMSE	0.084	0.089	0.086	0.090	0.090	0.098	0.087	0.094	0.092	0.098
X_2 ($j=2$)	Bias	0.009	0.005	0.011	0.004	0.009	-0.001	0.006	0.000	0.015	0.001
	RMSE	0.094	0.103	0.098	0.099	0.105	0.107	0.094	0.098	0.114	0.113
		Scenario 10		Scenario 11				Scenario 12			
Const. ($j=0$)	Bias	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.004	0.001	0.002	0.005	0.005	0.001	-0.003
	RMSE	0.061	0.070	0.060	0.069	0.068	0.081	0.063	0.074	0.067	0.083
X_1 ($j=1$)	Bias	0.001	-0.002	-0.002	0.000	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.001	0.000
	RMSE	0.058	0.064	0.059	0.063	0.064	0.067	0.059	0.064	0.065	0.068
X_2 ($j=2$)	Bias	0.004	0.000	0.006	-0.001	0.009	0.003	0.002	0.001	0.005	-0.002
	RMSE	0.068	0.070	0.069	0.068	0.074	0.073	0.069	0.070	0.081	0.076

Table 4: *Average absolute values of bias and RMSE for the estimates of the item parameters.*

	Item parameters		Item parameters					Item parameters				
	α_j	β_j	α_j	β_j	γ_{1j}	γ_{2j}	δ_j	α_j	β_j	γ_{1j}	γ_{2j}	δ_j
	Scenario 1		Scenario 2					Scenario 3				
bias	0.009	0.004	0.015	0.007	0.002	0.009	0.008	0.013	0.006	0.006	0.007	0.013
RMSE	0.110	0.111	0.134	0.127	0.087	0.109	0.100	0.138	0.128	0.108	0.114	0.109
	Scenario 4		Scenario 5					Scenario 6				
bias	0.005	0.003	0.006	0.005	0.002	0.005	0.005	0.007	0.004	0.004	0.005	0.005
RMSE	0.076	0.077	0.090	0.087	0.062	0.076	0.071	0.096	0.090	0.077	0.080	0.077
	Scenario 7		Scenario 8					Scenario 9				
bias	0.009	0.005	0.011	0.006	0.002	0.007	0.006	0.013	0.006	0.006	0.007	0.008
RMSE	0.105	0.107	0.122	0.122	0.082	0.099	0.097	0.131	0.123	0.104	0.103	0.107
	Scenario 10		Scenario 11					Scenario 12				
bias	0.004	0.003	0.005	0.003	0.001	0.003	0.004	0.005	0.004	0.003	0.003	0.005
RMSE	0.074	0.076	0.085	0.085	0.058	0.069	0.068	0.091	0.088	0.073	0.072	0.076

Table 5: *Estimated support points for the ability distribution ($\hat{u}^*_{h_1 d}$) and for the tendency to respond ($\hat{v}^*_{h_2}$) and corresponding average weights ($\hat{\bar{\lambda}}_{h_1}$, $\hat{\bar{\pi}}_{h_2}$). The support points are standardized so as to have mean 0 and variance 1.*

	Latent class h_1, h_2		
	1	2	3
Ability 1 ($\hat{u}^*_{1h_1}$)	-1.471	0.116	1.217
Ability 2 ($\hat{u}^*_{2h_1}$)	-1.189	-0.205	1.466
Ability 3 ($\hat{u}^*_{3h_1}$)	-1.603	0.356	0.956
Probability ($\hat{\bar{\lambda}}_{h_1}$)	0.267	0.452	0.280
Tendency ($\hat{v}^*_{h_2}$)	-1.046	0.051	2.296
Probability ($\hat{\bar{\pi}}_{h_2}$)	0.305	0.569	0.126

Table 6: *Estimates of correlation coefficients between latent traits, with non-parametric bootstrap standard errors in parentheses.*

	U_1	U_2	U_3
U_1	1.000	0.957	0.975
	(0.000)	(0.075)	(0.038)
U_2	0.957	1.000	0.869
	(0.075)	(0.000)	(0.133)
U_3	0.975	0.869	1.000
	(0.038)	(0.133)	(0.000)

Table 7: *Estimates of regression coefficients ($\hat{\phi}_{jh_1}$, $\hat{\psi}_{jh_2}$, $h_1, h_2 = 1, 2$), with non-parametric bootstrap standard errors in parentheses. Estimates of the parameters which are different from 0 at 5% significance level are indicated by a star ($*$).*

	$\hat{\phi}_{j1}$	$\hat{\phi}_{j2}$	$\hat{\psi}_{j1}$	$\hat{\psi}_{j2}$
Constant ($j = 0$)	-3.107*	-6.171*	-0.246	-0.922
	(1.165)	(1.302)	(0.672)	(0.955)
Gender ($j = 1$)	-1.331*	-2.243*	-0.276	-0.092
	(0.281)	(0.429)	(0.229)	(0.364)
Diploma ($j = 2$)	-1.168*	-3.866*	0.465	0.163
	(0.555)	(0.687)	(0.239)	(0.396)
Final mark ($j = 3$)	0.068*	0.116*	0.010	0.000
	(0.016)	(0.019)	(0.010)	(0.022)

Table 8: *Estimates of the item parameters under MNAR assumption ($\hat{\alpha}_j$, $\hat{\beta}_j$, $\hat{\gamma}_{1j}$, $\hat{\gamma}_{2j}$, $\hat{\delta}_j$) and under MAR assumption ($\tilde{\alpha}_j$, $\tilde{\beta}_j$). The latent traits are standardized and non-parametric bootstrap standard errors are in parentheses; estimates of the parameters different from 0 at the 5% significance level are indicated by a star ($*$).*

j	$\hat{\alpha}_j$	$\hat{\beta}_j$	$\hat{\gamma}_{1j}$	$\hat{\gamma}_{2j}$	$\hat{\delta}_j$	$\tilde{\alpha}_j$	$\tilde{\beta}_j$
1	0.466* (0.129)	-2.382* (0.110)	0.291 (0.276)	1.611* (0.485)	-3.964* (0.348)	0.575*(0.176)	-2.413*(0.132)
2	0.639* (0.138)	-2.168* (0.129)	0.362 (0.271)	1.267* (0.424)	-3.722* (0.289)	1.409*(0.193)	-0.513 (0.900)
3	0.981* (0.210)	-2.881* (0.197)	0.550* (0.188)	1.376* (0.253)	-3.159* (0.173)	1.954*(0.392)	-2.431 (2.512)
4	0.508* (0.100)	-0.185* (0.073)	0.070 (0.238)	1.644* (0.361)	-2.414* (0.191)	0.716*(0.105)	-0.762 (1.056)
5	0.836* (0.130)	-0.840* (0.085)	0.379 (0.200)	1.703* (0.379)	-2.221* (0.191)	2.012*(0.184)	0.008 (1.660)
6	0.855* (0.144)	-2.103* (0.126)	0.820* (0.265)	1.811* (0.478)	-3.501* (0.338)	1.890*(0.292)	-2.052 (2.327)
7	0.314* (0.109)	0.826* (0.091)	0.022 (0.149)	1.132* (0.226)	-0.334* (0.090)	0.389*(0.118)	2.032 (1.730)
8	0.781* (0.124)	-2.034* (0.115)	-0.045 (0.340)	2.119 (4.697)	-4.508 (4.554)	1.881*(0.192)	-0.531 (1.467)
9	1.106* (0.149)	-0.894* (0.095)	0.354 (0.245)	1.681* (0.424)	-3.432* (0.275)	2.096*(0.258)	-1.848 (2.380)
10	0.732* (0.120)	-1.411* (0.088)	1.295* (0.249)	1.676* (0.294)	-1.773* (0.178)	0.737*(0.175)	-1.852*(0.843)
11	0.201* (0.084)	-0.314* (0.061)	0.139 (0.200)	1.460* (0.311)	-1.637* (0.147)	0.610*(0.101)	1.300*(0.472)
12	0.772* (0.092)	0.219* (0.068)	-0.168 (0.219)	1.300* (0.287)	-2.391* (0.159)	1.293*(0.114)	0.151 (1.398)
13	1.106* (0.136)	0.615* (0.089)	-0.123 (0.196)	1.488* (0.312)	-2.021* (0.162)	1.382*(0.168)	-3.160 (2.129)
14	1.049* (0.156)	-0.904* (0.130)	0.426* (0.192)	1.269* (0.200)	0.325* (0.098)	0.999*(0.145)	-0.954*(0.116)
15	1.107* (0.144)	0.153 (0.150)	0.683* (0.182)	0.855* (0.110)	0.799* (0.075)	0.877*(0.170)	-0.730*(0.223)
16	0.714* (0.109)	-0.664* (0.087)	0.650* (0.151)	0.600* (0.101)	-0.852* (0.069)	0.379*(0.105)	-1.723*(0.159)
17	0.401* (0.103)	0.304* (0.084)	0.745* (0.153)	0.618* (0.099)	-0.243* (0.070)	0.349*(0.105)	1.289*(0.410)
18	0.438* (0.100)	-0.124 (0.073)	0.240 (0.169)	0.966* (0.143)	-0.533* (0.083)	0.402*(0.098)	-0.087 (0.199)
19	0.835* (0.176)	-1.885* (0.133)	0.620* (0.110)	0.603* (0.102)	-0.555* (0.077)	0.472*(0.155)	-3.398*(0.375)
20	-0.022 (0.237)	1.966* (0.188)	-0.491 (0.173)	1.032* (0.252)	0.856* (0.102)	0.017 (0.086)	118.802(187.769)
21	0.316* (0.087)	-0.279* (0.079)	0.847* (0.192)	1.128* (0.190)	-1.079* (0.106)	0.210*(0.090)	-0.591 (0.877)
22	0.914* (0.289)	-2.935* (0.246)	0.197 (0.132)	0.652* (0.156)	-1.843* (0.098)	0.546*(0.195)	-4.492*(0.524)
23	1.122* (0.284)	-2.273* (0.193)	0.517* (0.206)	1.329* (0.308)	-2.725* (0.188)	1.074*(0.173)	-2.194*(0.209)
24	1.303* (0.194)	-1.049* (0.128)	0.910* (0.192)	1.175* (0.229)	-1.094* (0.107)	0.994*(0.163)	-1.722*(0.122)
25	0.698* (0.106)	-0.147 (0.076)	0.325* (0.144)	0.949* (0.175)	-0.924* (0.095)	0.499*(0.109)	-1.338*(0.148)
26	1.034* (0.129)	-0.592* (0.096)	0.816* (0.178)	0.488* (0.106)	-1.031* (0.084)	0.966*(0.118)	-0.626*(0.113)
27	0.719* (0.106)	-1.414* (0.090)	0.331 (0.259)	1.864 (5.539)	-3.873 (5.172)	0.789*(0.101)	-1.447*(0.092)
28	0.482* (0.126)	-2.599* (0.124)	0.256 (2.604)	0.906 (7.230)	-5.106 (8.057)	0.345*(0.132)	-4.326 (2.338)
29	0.089 (0.100)	-2.021* (0.091)	-0.243 (0.222)	1.452* (0.351)	-2.360* (0.175)	0.209*(0.101)	-8.465 (64.210)
30	0.660* (0.165)	-3.171* (0.168)	0.500 (0.294)	1.476* (0.512)	-4.276* (0.455)	0.754*(0.162)	-3.314*(0.500)
31	0.658* (0.101)	-1.961* (0.111)	0.079 (7.143)	1.020 (14.208)	-5.850 (19.052)	0.468*(0.101)	-2.911*(0.276)
32	0.702* (0.166)	-3.028* (0.170)	0.858* (0.278)	1.965* (0.487)	-3.959* (0.378)	0.982*(0.143)	-2.625*(0.398)
33	0.404* (0.109)	-2.211* (0.094)	0.257 (0.311)	1.996* (0.533)	-3.809* (0.393)	0.432*(0.118)	-3.401*(1.106)
34	0.432* (0.097)	-0.527* (0.068)	-0.007 (0.292)	1.931* (0.389)	-2.116* (0.197)	0.324*(0.095)	-0.852*(0.148)
35	0.127 (0.074)	-0.579* (0.069)	-0.055 (0.221)	1.696* (0.404)	-2.710* (0.235)	0.169*(0.068)	-2.147 (10.596)
36	0.287* (0.094)	-0.003 (0.069)	-0.050 (0.302)	2.362* (0.467)	-2.213* (0.226)	0.294*(0.092)	0.901*(0.363)